exalting one attribute at the expence of another, equally neceſſary to divine perfection.

Reared on a falſe hypotheſis his arguments in favour of a ſtate of nature are plauſible, but unſound. I ſay unſound; for to aſſert that a ſtate of nature is preferable to civilization, in all its poſſible perfection, is, in other words, to arraign ſupreme wiſdom; and the paradoxical exclamation, that God has made all things right, and that evil has been introduced by the creature, whom he formed, knowing what he formed, is as unphiloſophical as impious.

When that wiſe Being who created us and placed us here, ſaw the fair idea, he willed, by allowing it to be ſo, that the paſſions ſhould unfold our reaſon, becauſe he could ſee that preſent evil would produce future good. Could the helpleſs creature whom he called from nothing break looſe from his providence, and boldly learn to know good by practiſing evil, without his permiſſion? No.—How could that energetic advocate for immortality argue ſo inconſiſtently? Had mankind remained for ever in the brutal ſtate of nature, which even his magic pen cannot paint as a ſtate in which a ſingle virtue took root, it would have been clear, though not to the ſenſitive

ſenſitive unreflecting wanderer, that man was born to run the circle of life and death, and adorn God's garden for ſome purpoſe which could not eaſily be reconciled with his attributes.

But if, to crown the whole, there were to be rational creatures produced, allowed to riſe in excellence by the exerciſe of powers implanted for that purpoſe; if benignity itſelf thought fit to call into exiſtence a creature above the brutes *, who could think and improve himſelf, why ſhould that ineſtimable gift, for a gift it was, if man was ſo created as to have a capacity to riſe above the ſtate in which ſenſation produced brutal eaſe, be called, in direct terms, a curſe? A curſe it might be reckoned, if all our exiſtence was bounded by our continuance in this world; for why ſhould the gracious fountain of life give us paſſions, and the power of reflecting, only to imbitter our days and inſpire us with

* Contrary to the opinion of anatomiſts, who argue by analogy from the formation of the teeth, ſtomach, and inteſtines, Rouſſeau will not allow a man to be a carnivorous animal. And, carried away from nature by a love of ſyſtem, he diſputes whether man be a gregarious animal, though the long and helpleſs ſtate of infancy ſeems to point him out as particularly impelled to pair.